

The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law

## CUA Law Scholarship Repository

---

Scholarly Articles and Other Contributions

Faculty Scholarship

---

1992

### Psychological Type Theory in the Legal Profession

Raymond B. Marcin

*The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/scholar>



Part of the [Law and Psychology Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Raymond B. Marcin, Psychological Type Theory in the Legal Profession, 24 U. TOLEDO L. REV. 103 (1992).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at CUA Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarly Articles and Other Contributions by an authorized administrator of CUA Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [edinger@law.edu](mailto:edinger@law.edu).

## PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE THEORY IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION

Raymond B. Marcin\*

FOR some time now the phenomenon known as psychological typing has been finding its way into the study and even the practice of law. The phenomenon has its origin in the notion that people are different in ways that are meaningfully categorizable and classifiable, i.e., that there are genuine, empirically verifiable psychological "types" among people, with the members of each type possessing similar psychological characteristics to some significant extent. The phenomenon is based in Jungian psychology, but its influence has extended well beyond that discipline and into others, including the law and lawyering. More than two decades ago, in an article published in the *Journal of Legal Education*, a program director for the Educational Testing Service suggested that a positive correlation existed between personality type and law school survival and attrition.<sup>1</sup> The article is still influential today.<sup>2</sup> College pre-law advisors have taken to using psychological typing indicators as aids in career counseling. In other contexts, family law practitioners, following the lead of many marriage counselors, now use psychological typing indicators as conciliation tools, and law firms, following the lead of corporate management in general, are beginning to use them in personnel development programs. What is psychological typing? What are psychological typing indicators? Is the theory behind them sound? Are they useful, or dangerous, or perhaps both? These are the questions that will be addressed in this article.

Psychological typing is based on a theory developed by analytical psychologist Carl Jung.<sup>3</sup> Based on the psychological "attitudes" and "functions" that he observed not only in his patients and in himself but also in his prolific studies of history, biography, philosophy and the humanities in general, Jung concluded that human beings can be grouped

---

\* Professor of Law, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law. A.B., 1959, St. John's Seminary, Boston; J.D., 1964, Fordham; M.L.S., 1984, Catholic University.

1. Paul V. Miller, *Personality Differences and Student Survival in Law School*, 19 J. LEGAL EDUC. 460 (1967).

2. See Paul T. Wangerin, *Objective, Multiplistic, and Relative Truth in Developmental Psychology and Legal Education*, 62 TUL. L. REV. 1237, 1268-69 (1988); Lisa Green, *Jungian Analysis Yields Picture of Student's Personality Traits*, NAT'L L.J., Aug. 8, 1988, at 4; Donna Prokop, "Judgers," "Thinkers" Do Best in Law School, LOS ANGELES DAILY J., Sept. 12, 1988, at B18, col. 1.

3. Although Jung developed type theory, he was not its originator. He was, however, the first to use type theory regularly as a therapeutic tool. See JUNE SINGER, *BOUNDARIES OF THE SOUL: THE PRACTICE OF JUNG'S PSYCHOLOGY* 185 (1972).

into a number of psychological "types."<sup>4</sup> Jung's account of psychological *attitudes* has already found its way into our everyday speech. We often speak of people as being extraverts or introverts (and it was Jung who coined the terms). With respect to the psychological *functions*,<sup>5</sup> Jung identified four—thinking, feeling (or valuing), sensing and intuiting—and he posited that each human being, while possessing all four, has a marked preference for one or another in much the same way as a person has a marked preference for the use of one hand or the other.

Psychological typing *indicators* are devices, usually appearing in question-and-answer format, designed to help people identify and learn about their particular personality typology. Psychological typing indicators both predate and postdate the work of Jung, and Jung himself was not deeply involved in the efforts to develop workable type indicators. They are, however, widely used today, both on an individual counseling and on a general research basis.

To say that psychological typing has been finding its way into legal education and into the practice of law is not to say that it has received a cordial welcome in either arena. It has met with some resistance and has struggled with what is commonly referred to as "bad press." The very term "psychological typing" suggests "stereotyping," and stereotyping is something that we have come to recognize as a fault or a flaw in social thinking. Even its advocates would likely concede that psychological typing, superficially understood and ineptly applied, is a form of stereotyping—one that can cause and exacerbate social and individual wounds.<sup>6</sup> However, its proponents claim that, correctly understood and responsibly applied, psychological typing has great potential for healing and for bringing people together and has a positive role to play in creating a world in which human differences constructively complement one another.<sup>7</sup> The curious thing about psychological type theory is that it is viewed as either heresy or salvation. There seems to be no middle ground.

---

4. CARL G. JUNG, *PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPES* (1921), reprinted in 6 *THE COLLECTED WORKS OF C. G. JUNG* (William McGuire et. al. eds. & R.C.F. Hull trans., 1971). Jung identified a set of eight "demonstrable" function types. *Id.* at 554. Elsewhere, however, Jung intimated that the number of types was "at least sixteen" and possibly many more. See C. G. JUNG, *SPEAKING: INTERVIEWS AND ENCOUNTERS* 342 (William McGuire & R.C.F. Hull eds., 1977) [hereinafter *INTERVIEWS*].

5. Jung called them "the four orienting functions of consciousness." See CARL G. JUNG, *TWO ESSAYS ON ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY*, reprinted in 7 *THE COLLECTED WORKS OF C. G. JUNG*, *supra* note 4, at 44.

6. The Association for Psychological Type has, in fact, promulgated a set of ethical principles and views itself as largely existing in order to encourage the ethical and appropriate use of psychological type theory. See BULL. PSYCHOL. TYPE, Summer 1988, at 5-6. For an example of the "bad press" that psychological type indicators sometimes receive, see John L. Grahn, *Personality Testing*, *FORTUNE*, May 11, 1987 at 44.

7. See, e.g., ISABEL B. MYERS, *GIFTS DIFFERING* x (1980). A type-indicator pioneer, Isabel Briggs Myers was partially motivated by the horrors of World War II and saw an understanding of psychological type theory as a means of avoiding destructive conflicts.

## THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF TYPE THEORY

Personality typology has a long and somewhat checkered history. Perhaps the oldest attempts at typology are those that developed within one of humankind's oldest and most controversial speculative pursuits—astrology. In oriental astrology, the twelve signs of the zodiac were divided into four groupings: earth signs, air signs, fire signs and water signs. Anyone born under one or another of the groupings was believed to have personality characteristics peculiar to that grouping.<sup>8</sup>

During the 5th century, B.C., Hippocrates introduced a personality typology keyed to one's supposed physiological condition. The typology was also endorsed by Claudius Galen in the 2nd century, A.D. According to Hippocrates and Galen, differences in personality among human beings were deemed to be caused by bodily "humors," imbalances in the major bodily fluids. For example, liver bile was associated with the "choleric" personality, blood with the "sanguine" personality, kidney bile with the "melancholic" personality and phlegm with the "phlegmatic" personality.<sup>9</sup> Both systems, i.e., the astrological groupings and the four temperaments system of Hippocrates, proved unusually persistent over the centuries. Jung himself remarked, speaking first of the four temperaments system: "As is well known, this typology lasted at least seventeen hundred years. As for the astrological type theory, to the astonishment of the enlightened it still remains intact today, and is even enjoying a new vogue."<sup>10</sup>

This ancient history of type theory understandably seems to be something of an embarrassment to the contemporary type theorists. Isabel Briggs Myers ignores it in her major work.<sup>11</sup> David Keirsey and Marilyn Bates mention the four temperaments theory briefly, but not the astrological groupings system.<sup>12</sup>

In truth, to most contemporary minds, the etiologies in ancient type theory are an embarrassment, but as Jung correctly understood, their very endurance alone over the centuries says something. It tells us that there has long been a ready disposition to accept the proposition that psychological types do exist and seem to have existed for all of remembered time. Types may not be explainable in terms of birth dates or of phlegm, blood and bile, but if they exist as a psychological phenomenon, they

---

8. An example of the amazing resilience of astrological personality typing is the phenomenon of the "no water signs" admonition given to some personnel managers in recent decades. The phenomenon actually found mention in recent fair employment cases. See, e.g., *Garcia v. Gloor*, 618 F.2d 264, 269 (5th Cir. 1980); *Vuyanich v. Republic Nat'l Bank*, 505 F. Supp. 224, 262 n.36 (N.D. Tex. 1980).

9. DAVID KRECH & RICHARD S. CRUTCHFIELD, *ELEMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY* 611, 613 (1965).

10. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 531.

11. MYERS, *supra* note 7.

12. DAVID KEIRSEY & MARILYN M. BATES, *PLEASE UNDERSTAND ME: CHARACTER AND TEMPERAMENT TYPES* 3, 4 (1984). Keirsey and Bates do, however, relate their own version (i.e., without the connections to phlegm, blood, and bile) of a four-temperaments approach to contemporary typologies. *Id.* at 27-66.

must have an etiology Jung's great contribution to type theory was that he provided a workable scientific etiology

### JUNGLIAN TYPE THEORY

Academic interest in the notion of personality types was fairly strong around the time that Jung was formulating his theory Keirsey and Bates give accounts of at least four other scholars who wrote about temperament or type: Adickes, Kretschmer, Adler and Spranger<sup>13</sup> But it was Jung's theory that eventually became dominant.

A catalyst in Jung's professional career (as in Adler's) was his break with Freud.<sup>14</sup> It occurred in 1913, and it eventually led in a curious way to his "discovery" of the theory of psychological types. The separation from Freud propelled Jung into a profound, even disturbing, personal transformation, but perhaps more importantly it freed him to think independently Shortly after the break with Freud, Jung discovered a vexing problem. There was a theoretical disagreement between Freud and Adler. It dealt with the psychology of fantasy<sup>15</sup> Freud had traced the origin of fantasy to "instinct," while Adler had traced it to "ego."<sup>16</sup> Both theories were internally consistent and made sense, and yet externally they were in conflict with each other. The one or the other had to be correct, yet both seemed to be correct. Yet again, both could not be. It was Jung's resolution of this apparently small, perhaps even slight, discrepancy between Freudian and Adlerian theory that accidentally led to his discovery and formulation of the theory of psychological types.

Jung's insight was that there is a basic duality or polarity in the psychological *attitude* of the human being, a duality or polarity which enables, indeed determines, some human beings to prefer viewing reality from one basic psychological vantage point, and other human beings viewing the same reality from a different, yet equally basic and equally

---

13. See *id.* at 3. Keirsey and Bates cite ERICH ADICKES, *CHARACTER UND WELTANSCHAUUNG* (1907) (according to Adickes, there are four world views: dogmatic, agnostic, traditional and innovative); ERNST KRETSCHMER, *PHISIQUE AND CHARACTER* (1925) (Kretschmer identified four determinants of abnormal behavior: hyperesthetic, anesthetic, melancholic and hypomaniac, i.e., too sensitive, too insensitive, too serious and too excitable); *THE INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY OF ALFRED ADLER* (Heinz L. Ansbacher & Rowena R. Ansbacher eds., 1956) [hereinafter ADLER] (an account of Adler's views, circa 1920, identifying four "mistaken goals" people of differing types pursue when they are upset: recognition, power, service and revenge); and EDUARD SPRANGER, *TYPES OF MEN* (1928) (Spranger identified four human values that seem to set people apart: religious, theoretic, economic and artistic). Keirsey contends that in each case the four factors identified by each scholar correspond, respectively, to each of the four ancient temperaments: choleric, phlegmatic, melancholic and sanguine. See DAVID KEIRSEY, *PORTRAITS OF TEMPERAMENT* 8 (1987).

14. See GERHARD WEHR, *JUNG: A BIOGRAPHY* 127-64 (David M. Weeks trans., 1988).

15. Freud's work in this area was, of course, monumental. See SIGMUND FREUD, *THE INTERPRETATION OF DREAMS* (1914).

16. ADLER, *supra* note 13, at 357-59.

valid, vantage point. Freud's vantage point or psychological attitude, Jung concluded, was extraversion, while Adler's was introversion: "Freud would like to ensure the undisturbed flow of instinct towards its object; Adler would like to break the baleful spell of the object in order to save the ego from suffocating in its own defensive armor. Freud's view is essentially extraverted, Adler's introverted."<sup>17</sup> Each man's view of reality was correct, but each was viewing reality from a different angle. It is as if some of us see the world full face and others in profile. Each viewpoint is valid. Neither is complete. And each, in a sense, needs the other for a better perspective.

Jung defined extraversion as "an outward-turning of *libido* (psychic energy) a positive movement of subjective interest towards the object" and introversion as "an inward-turning of *libido* (in which) [i]nterest does not move towards the object but withdraws from it into the subject."<sup>18</sup> In simplistic terms, extraverts are energized by the outer world of people and events; introverts are energized by the inner world of subjective impressions and ideas.

As was characteristic of Jung, his insightful discovery of the introvert/extravert attitude transcended the immediate problem of reconciling Freudian and Adlerian thought and sent him on a dizzying trek through history, literature, philosophy, biography and aesthetics.<sup>19</sup> In a different direction it sent him on another journey, through twenty or more years of a practical case-study analyses of his own patients.<sup>20</sup> The result was a fully developed and defended theory of psychological types. Jung discovered, historically and empirically, that human beings are categorizable and classifiable not only with respect to psychological *attitude*, i.e., extraversion/introversion, but also with respect to a preference for the use of one or another of the psychological "functions" of sensing, intuiting, thinking and feeling. The functions, in turn, he subcategorized into "rational" ones (thinking and feeling) and "irrational" ones (sensing and intuiting):

I distinguish four functions: *thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition*. The essential function of sensation is to establish that something exists, thinking tells us what it means, feeling what its value is, and intuition surmises whence it comes and whither it goes. Sensation and intuition I call irrational functions, because they are both concerned simply with what happens and with actual or potential realities. Thinking and feeling, being discriminating functions, are rational.<sup>21</sup>

17. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 62.

18. *Id.* at 427, 452. In Jungian theory, "libido" has a far more general and less focused meaning than in Freudian theory. In Freudian theory, the term designates the sexual drive. In Jungian theory, it simply means "psychic energy." See JOLANDE S. JACOBI, *THE PSYCHOLOGY OF C. G. JUNG* 52 (1942) (R. Manheim trans., 1973).

19. WEHR, *supra* note 14, at 127-28.

20. See generally *id.* at 199-214 (detailing Jung's empirical approach).

21. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 553.

To support his contention that the concept of rationality embraces both thinking and feeling, Jung cited "modern philosophers," including Arthur Schopenhauer. It may well be that the origins of Jung's decision to focus on four and only four orienting functions of consciousness lie in Schopenhauer's theory of knowledge.<sup>22</sup> Jung was decidedly well versed in Schopenhauer's thought.<sup>23</sup> Schopenhauer, a century before Jung, identified sensing and intuiting as "perceiving" functions and may have grouped feeling with thinking as "judging" functions since he did view both feeling and thinking as "modifications of consciousness." Schopenhauer also saw thinking and feeling as polar opposites (as did Jung, of course).<sup>24</sup>

Another explanation is perhaps simpler and more closely connected with original Jungian insights. Quaternity, or "fourness," looms very large throughout Jungian theory "Four" is the symbol of wholeness, completion. Jung has referred to the number four as an archetype in itself.<sup>25</sup> Hillman has suggested that the four functions in Jungian typology might be more archetypal than empirical.<sup>26</sup>

The function which Jung designated as "thinking" is fairly self-explanatory. It involves impersonal, logical, cause-and-effect reasoning. "Feeling" in Jungian thought is more problematic. It signifies not emotionalism, but rather an evaluative mental process that weighs choices in terms of likes and dislikes. It deems an extraverted attitude "people-oriented" and an introverted attitude "cause-oriented." "Sensing" is the function that focuses on immediate reality, the practical facts of life and experience. "Intuition" involves possibilities, nonobvious relationships and meanings; Jung himself used the word "hunches."<sup>27</sup>

Jung's choice of the designations "rational" and "irrational" for the two groupings of functions was probably unfortunate. In the English language, the adjective "rational" tends to be associated closely with the thinking process, and the adjective "irrational" suggests something that contradicts reason. Jung did not intend to imply that sensing and intuiting contradict reason, merely that they do not depend on rationality for their effectuation, i.e., they involve information reception and not information analysis ("arational" might have been a more exact, though hardly more felicitous, adjective). What Jung seems to have meant is that sensing and intuiting are simply ways of taking in information, whereas thinking and

---

22. That is indeed the thesis of at least one scholar. See J. Gruesen, *The Philosophical Implications of Carl Gustav Jung's Individuation Process* (1956) (unpublished thesis, Catholic University of America). Gruesen relates Jung's four "functions" to Schopenhauer's "Fourfold Root of Sufficient Reason." See ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER, *ON THE FOURFOLD ROOT OF SUFFICIENT REASON* (E.F.J. Payne trans., 1974).

23. See, e.g., JUNG, *supra* note 5, at 144; INTERVIEWS, *supra* note 4, at 207.

24. See 1 ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER, *THE WORLD AS WILL AND REPRESENTATION* 50-53 (E.F.J. Payne trans., 1958); 2 *id.* at 26-31, 80.

25. Carl G. Jung, *Mandalas*, in *THE ESSENTIAL JUNG* 235, 236 (Anthony Storr ed., 1983).

26. See JAMES HILLMAN, *EGALITARIAN TYPOLOGIES VERSUS THE PERCEPTION OF THE UNIQUE* 21 (1980).

27. See, e.g., INTERVIEWS, *supra* note 4, at 342.

feeling involve making decisions about the information. Elsewhere, and more helpfully, he referred to sensation and intuition as "perceiving" functions as Schopenhauer did a century before and to thinking and feeling as "judging" functions.<sup>28</sup> The categorizations "perceiving" and "judging" have been picked up and used by contemporary personality type theorists and seem to have proven more useful and less confusing.<sup>29</sup>

An important part of Jung's typology theory has to do with the concept of polarity or opposites. In Jung's thought, the two "rational" functions are opposed to each other, as are the two "irrational" functions:

Sensation rules out any simultaneous intuitive activity, since the latter is not concerned with the present but is rather a sixth sense for hidden possibilities, and therefore should not allow itself to be unduly influenced by existing reality. In the same way, thinking is opposed to feeling, because thinking should not be influenced or deflected from its purpose by feeling values, just as feeling is usually vitiated by too much reflection. The four functions therefore form, when arranged diagrammatically, a cross with a rational axis at right angles to an irrational axis.<sup>30</sup>

In other words, one can feel (i.e., evaluate) and think, but one cannot do both at the same instant. Similarly, one can heed sensations and intuitions, but not at the same instant. And one will have a habitual preference for one of those four orienting functions of consciousness. One function and one attitude will be dominant, and when this occurs, as it invariably does according to Jung and other type theorists, the attitude and the function at the opposite ends of the respective poles revert to the unconscious;<sup>31</sup> with less use, the unconscious (or markedly less conscious) attitude and the unconscious (or markedly less conscious) function become less well developed. Thus, according to Jung's typology, everyone has a dominant attitude and a dominant function and an inferior, largely unconscious, attitude and an inferior, largely unconscious, function. The inferior function will invariably be the polar opposite of the dominant function. For example, one whose dominant function is thinking will invariably have feeling as one's inferior function and vice versa. Similarly, one whose dominant function is sensation will invariably have intuition as one's inferior function and vice versa. There is, however, no polar inconsistency between one of the so-called rational functions and one of

28. See, e.g., JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 538, 539.

29. See ANDREW SAMUELS, JUNG AND THE POST-JUNGIAN 85 (1985).

30. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 553-54.

31. In Jungian psychology, the psyche is "two-sided," with consciousness forming only one of the two sides. The unconscious side comprises, at least in part, what the conscious side rejects or denies. The conscious side of the psyche casts a "shadow" (Jung's word) in the unconscious, a shadow that compensates for the one-sidedness of the contents of the conscious personality. The unconscious in Jungian psychology is a fascinating realm, peopled by semi-autonomous archetypes and containing both personal and transpersonal or "collective" elements. See, e.g., JUNG, *supra* note 5, at 176-78. See also CARL G. JUNG, *ARCHETYPES OF THE COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS* (1934).



the irrational functions (although there is opposition), and the individual will, "invariably" according to Jung, have a secondary function from the other category.<sup>32</sup> Thus, if the dominant function is one of judgment, i.e., one of the rational functions of thinking or feeling, the secondary function will be one of perception, i.e., one of the irrational functions of sensing or intuiting. This secondary function is today more commonly referred to as the "auxiliary" function.<sup>33</sup>

Jung's typology, based as it is on psychological attitude plus orienting function, yields eight psychological types, one for each of the four psychological functions of sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling, doubled to account for the two psychological attitudes of introversion and extraversion. Thus, Jung's eight types are: extraverted thinking, introverted thinking, extraverted feeling, introverted feeling, extraverted sensing, introverted sensing, extraverted intuitive and introverted intuitive.<sup>34</sup>

### CONTEMPORARY TYPE THEORY

As has been indicated above, Jung divided the four orienting functions of consciousness into two groupings, the rational or judging functions on the one hand, and the irrational or perceiving functions on the other. One might have expected him to operatively work this division into his theory. He did, of course, use the distinction in his identification of the dominant and auxiliary functions, and it was at this point that Jung came closest to formulating a system of more than eight personality types. For example, the logical implication of Jung's assertion that people have dominant *and auxiliary* functions was that a given individual was not simply, say, an extraverted thinking type, but rather an extraverted thinking/sensing or extraverted thinking/intuitive type, with thinking as the dominant function and either sensing or intuiting as the auxiliary.

Contemporary type theorists have taken the implications of Jung's rational/irrational or judging/perceiving division somewhat further than Jung did. Myers has regarded the judging/perceiving distinction as an *attitude* distinction<sup>35</sup> and was in agreement with Jung that there was a fundamental opposition between judging and perceiving:<sup>36</sup> "There is a fundamental opposition between the two attitudes. In order to come to a conclusion, people use the judging attitude and have to shut off perception for the time being. Conversely, in the perceptive attitude people shut

---

32. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 405.

33. See, e.g., Alex T. Quenk & Naomi L. Quenk, *The Use of Psychological Typography in Analysis*, in JUNGIAN ANALYSIS 157, 160 (Murray Stein ed., 1982).

34. Jung's own descriptions of the eight types are found in JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 330-407.

35. MYERS, *supra* note 7, at 8.

36. Using the rational/irrational terminology, Jung has said that "[i]rrationality is a vice where thinking and feeling are called for, rationality is a vice where sensation and intuition should be trusted." JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 539.

off judgment."<sup>37</sup> Perceiving involves gathering input, and judging involves doing something with or about it. Myers' choice of the term "attitude" for the judging/perceiving dichotomy was perhaps as unfortunate as Jung's choice of the rational/irrational terminology. "Attitude" seems to needlessly confuse the judging/perceiving dichotomy with the introvert/extravert attitudes. Introversion or extraversion can coexist with *any* one of the four orienting functions of consciousness. Judging can only be associated with the thinking and feeling functions, and perceiving only with the sensing and intuitive functions. The judging/perceiving dichotomy simply refers to one's orientation to the outer world. One might even think of it in terms of one's lifestyle. Elsewhere, and perhaps more helpfully, Myers has used the term "process" to refer to the judging and perceiving activities,<sup>38</sup> and that term does seem more felicitous. Gathering information or input does seem to be a process, as does deciding what to do with it.

Perhaps Myers' greatest contribution to Jungian type theory was the operative effectuation of Jung's recognition that judging and perceiving are type preferences along with the attitude and function preferences.<sup>39</sup> People, of course, quite often and commonly use both (i.e., judging and perceiving), but people also seem to exhibit an overall preference for one approach or the other. In simple terms, some of us like to have things ordered and decided, and others of us like to keep our options open.

Another of Myers' contributions concerns the auxiliary or secondary function, which Myers saw as a balancing agent between extraversion and introversion.<sup>40</sup> Not all Jungian theorists see it that way. In fact, Mary Ann Mattoon has indicated that Jung himself assumed that the dominant and auxiliary functions are "of the same attitude,"<sup>41</sup> i.e., if one is an extraverted thinking type with an intuitive auxiliary function, the intuitive auxiliary function will *also* be extraverted. Myers, however, has disagreed and has argued that Jung himself regarded the dominant and the auxiliary as differing in attitude.<sup>42</sup> According to her, if one is an extraverted thinking type with an intuitive auxiliary function, the intuitive function will invariably be *introverted*.<sup>43</sup> Myers' view does seem to provide a needed balance, especially in the case of an introverted personality whose dominant function is by definition turned inward. Without an auxiliary function turned outward, the introverted personality would seem to lack the wherewithal to deal successfully or even adequately with the outside world. Also, if the judging functions of thinking and feeling are *opposed* to the perceiving functions of sensing and intuiting (as Myers and Jung both believed), then it is difficult to understand how a judging function can coexist with a perceiving function (as a dominant coexists with an auxiliary in Jungian

---

37. MYERS, *supra* note 7, at 9.

38. *Id.* at 70.

39. *See id.* at 9.

40. *Id.* at 19, 20.

41. MARY ANN MATTOON, JUNGIAN PSYCHOLOGY IN PERSPECTIVE 67 (1981).

42. MYERS, *supra* note 7, at 19, 20.

43. *Id.* at 12, 13.

theory). The most feasible way in which "opposed" functions could coexist, it would seem, is if they each existed in a different *attitude*, the one extraverted and the other introverted.

Finally, working the judging/perceiving preference into her Jungian approach, Myers noted that it seems to be concerned solely with one's interaction with the outside world or at least with the input that one receives from the outside world.<sup>44</sup> In other words, the judging/perceiving process is *always extraverted*. The result is that, in Myers' system, it is fairly easy to identify which is the dominant function and which is the auxiliary. The judging/perceiving preference identifies the dominant function for the extravert and the auxiliary function for the introvert.<sup>45</sup> Thus, if one is an extraverted thinking/intuitive type, and if there seems to be some uncertainty as to whether the thinking function or the intuitive function is the dominant one, the judging/perceiving preference will resolve the issue. If the extraverted thinking/intuitive type shows a preference for, say, judging rather than perceiving, then thinking (being a judging function) will automatically be the dominant function, and intuition will be the auxiliary. As indicated above, the situation would be different for the introvert because the introvert's dominant function is, of course, introverted, while the judging/perceiving preference is always extraverted. Thus, if one is an *introverted* thinking/intuitive type, and if there seems to be some uncertainty as to whether the thinking function or the intuitive function is the dominant one, the judging/perceiving preference will similarly resolve the issue, although the application of the principle is a bit more complicated than in the case of the extravert. Recall that the judging/perceiving preference identifies directly, *not* the *dominant* function (although it coincides with the dominant function in the case of the extravert), but rather the function that one uses in dealing with input from the outside world. For an *introvert*, that would be the *auxiliary* function (because by definition the introvert's dominant function is directed to the "inside" or subjective world). Therefore, if our introverted thinking/perceiving type shows a preference for, say, judging rather than perceiving, then thinking (being a judging function) will automatically be our introvert's *auxiliary* function, and by process of elimination intuition must be the dominant function.<sup>46</sup>

The end result is that Myers has not only created a sixteen-type matrix (as distinguished from Jung's eight-type system<sup>47</sup>), but has also created an efficient means of identifying the *positional import* of the functions and attitudes in any given personality. Each of the sixteen types is characterized by the four categorical preferences discussed above, i.e., introverted/extraverted, sensing/intuitive, feeling/thinking and perceiving/judging, and

---

44. *Id.* at 15.

45. *Id.* at 15-16.

46. *See id.* at 15, 16.

47. In his magnum opus on the subject, Jung described in detail only eight psychological types. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 330-407. Elsewhere, however, Jung asserted that the number of human types is "at least sixteen." *See* INTERVIEWS, *supra* note 4, at 342.

by the designation of one of the function preferences as the dominant and the other as the auxiliary. Myers and others use initials for ease of reference (because "introverted" and "intuitive" begin with the same letter, the convention is to assign the "I" to "introverted" and to refer to "intuitive" by its second letter, "N"). Thus, an ENTJ type is one whose personality is *extraverted*, who prefers the *intuitive* and the *thinking* functions and whose attitude towards the outside world is one of *judging*. Since an extraverted personality uses its *dominant* function in dealing with the outside world, and since the preferred process of the ENTJ in dealing with the outside world is a *judging* one, and since of the two preferred functions *thinking* is the *judging* one, then the ENTJ's *dominant* function is *thinking*, and the *auxiliary* is *intuition*.

An introverted personality type is analyzed in the same manner, but as indicated above confusion sometimes arises from the fact that an introvert's *dominant* function is *not* ordinarily used in dealing with the outside world. For example, an INTJ type is one whose personality is *introverted*, who prefers the *intuitive* and the *thinking* functions and whose attitude towards the outside world is one of *judging*. Since the *introverted* personality uses its dominant function *not* in dealing with the outside world primarily, but rather in an inner-directed manner, and since the preferred process of the INTJ in dealing with the outside world is one of *judging*, and since of the two preferred functions *thinking* is the *judging* one, then the INTJ's *auxiliary* function is *thinking*, and the *dominant* one (the one that an *introverted* personality does *not* ordinarily use in dealing with the outside world) is *intuition*.

#### TYPE DESCRIPTIONS

The characteristics of each of the sixteen personality types are determined in theory by the interplay of the various attitudes (introverted/extroverted), functions (sensing, intuiting, thinking and feeling) and processes (perceiving and judging).

Lengthy descriptions of each of the sixteen Myers-Briggs personality types can be found in the literature on psychological typology.<sup>48</sup> No brief description, and probably no lengthy one as well, can possibly grasp all the nuances of each personality type, nor can it touch upon every context in which type becomes relevant.<sup>49</sup> The following type table, however, is widely accepted and in general use among practitioners who use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator:<sup>50</sup>

---

48. See, e.g., ISABEL B. MYERS, INTRODUCTION TO TYPE 10-25 (1980); MYERS, *supra* note 7, at 83-116; KEIRSEY & BATES, *supra* note 12, at 167-207.

49. For descriptions dealing with the context of teaching and learning, see GORDON LAWRENCE, PEOPLE TYPES & TIGER STRIPES: A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO LEARNING STYLES 52, 53 (2d ed. 1982).

50. ISABEL B. MYERS & MARY H. MCCAULLEY, MANUAL: A GUIDE TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR 20, 21 (1985).

CHARACTERISTICS FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WITH EACH TYPE					
Sensing Types			Intuitive Types		
I N T R O V E R T S	ISTJ Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic, and dependable. See to it that everything is well organized. Take responsibility. Make up their own minds as to what should be accomplished and work toward it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions.	ISFJ Quiet, friendly, responsible, and conscientious. Work devotedly to meet their obligations. Lend stability to any project or group. Thorough, painstaking, accurate. Their interests are usually not technical. Can be patient with necessary details. Loyal, considerate, perceptive, concerned with how other people feel.	INFJ Succeed by perseverance, originality, and desire to do whatever is needed or wanted. Put their best efforts into their work. Quietly forceful, conscientious, concerned for others. Respected for their firm principles. Likely to be honored and followed for their clear convictions as to how best to serve the common good.	INTJ Usually have original minds and great drive for their own ideas and purposes. In fields that appeal to them, they have a fine power to organize a job and carry it through with or without help. Skeptical, critical, independent, determined, sometimes stubborn. Must learn to yield less important points in order to win the most important.	I N T R O V E R T S
	ISTP Cool onlookers—quiet, reserved, observing and analyzing life with detached curiosity and unexpected flashes of original humor. Usually interested in cause and effect, how and why mechanical things work, and in organizing facts using logical principles.	ISFP Retiring, quietly friendly, sensitive, kind, modest about their abilities. Shun disagreements, do not force their opinions or values on others. Usually do not care to lead but are often loyal followers. Often relaxed about getting things done, because they enjoy the present moment and do not want to spoil it by undue haste or exertion.	INFP Full of enthusiasms and loyalties, but seldom talk of these until they know you well. Care about learning, ideas, language, and independent projects of their own. Tend to undertake too much, then somehow get it done. Friendly, but often too absorbed in what they are doing to be sociable. Little concerned with possessions or physical surroundings.	INTP Quiet and reserved. Especially enjoy theoretical or scientific pursuits. Like solving problems with logic and analysis. Usually interested mainly in ideas, with little liking for parties or small talk. Tend to have sharply defined interests. Need careers where some strong interest can be used and useful.	
E X T R O V E R T S	ESTP Good at on-the-spot problem solving. Do not worry, enjoy whatever comes along. Tend to like mechanical things and sports, with friends on the side. Adaptable, tolerant, generally conservative in values. Dislike long explanations. Are best with real things that can be worked, handled, taken apart, or put together.	ESFP Outgoing, easygoing, accepting, friendly, enjoy everything and make things more fun for others by their enjoyment. Like sports and making things happen. Know what's going on and join in eagerly. Find remembering facts easier than mastering theories. Are best in situations that need sound common sense and practical ability with people as well as with things.	ENFP Warmly enthusiastic, high-spirited, ingenious, imaginative. Able to do almost anything that interests them. Quick with a solution for any difficulty and ready to help anyone with a problem. Often rely on their ability to improvise instead of preparing in advance. Can usually find compelling reasons for whatever they want.	ENTP Quick, ingenious, good at many things. Stimulating company, alert and outspoken. May argue for fun on either side of a question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems, but may neglect routine assignments. Apt to turn to one new interest after another. Skillful in finding logical reasons for what they want.	E X T R O V E R T S
	ESTJ Practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, with a natural head for business or mechanics. Not interested in subjects they see no use for, but can apply themselves when necessary. Like to organize and run activities. May make good administrators, especially if they remember to consider others' feelings and points of view.	ESFJ Warm-hearted, talkative, popular, conscientious, born cooperators, active committee members. Need harmony and may be good at creating it. Always doing something nice for someone. Work best with encouragement and praise. Main interest is in things that directly and visibly affect people's lives.	ENFJ Responsive and responsible. Generally feel real concern for what others think or want, and try to handle things with due regard for the other person's feelings. Can present a proposal or lead a group discussion with ease and tact. Sociable, popular, sympathetic. Responsive to praise and criticism.	ENTJ Hearty, frank, decisive, leaders in activities. Usually good in anything that requires reasoning and intelligent talk, such as public speaking. Are usually well informed and enjoy adding to their fund or knowledge. May sometimes appear more positive and confident than their experience in an area warrants.	

The foregoing descriptions of the sixteen Myers-Briggs/Jungian types, brief though they are, suggest both the utility and the danger in taking psychological type seriously. Types do complement one another,<sup>51</sup> and an understanding of type can facilitate cooperation and tolerance. However, there are dangers, and they come mainly from an incomplete or superficial understanding of type. For example, a prospective employer, on reviewing the descriptions, might decide that the INFJ type seems to make the ideal employee and might deliberately try to hire only INFJs. Superficially there may seem to be advantages to doing that, but only superficially.<sup>52</sup> By hiring only INFJs, the employer sacrifices the adaptability of the INFP personality, for example, as well as the logical and analytical propensities of the INTJs, the attention to fact and detail characteristic of the ISFJ and the responsiveness and breadth of interests of the ENFJs. In other words, psychological type theory can be a trap for the unwary who have only a superficial understanding. And, make no mistake, it opens the door for new forms of misguided categorical discrimination.

The truth of the matter is that the various types need one another. Each possesses gifts, but not all gifts, and the true utility of type phenomenon lies in an understanding of that fact. Types complement; unfortunately, they also often conflict. According to Singer, "[t]he truest thing that can be said about psychological types is that there are many of them and anyone who concerns himself with typology must ask the question, 'Will one type ever truly understand another?'"<sup>53</sup> The question is, perhaps, not a fair one. Types, as such, do not possess the faculty of understanding, but people do. And although Dr. Singer may have asked the question in an unfair form, she answered it fairly. It was her experience, in marriage and family counseling in particular, that people can be brought to an understanding and an acceptance of differences and that such an understanding and acceptance can have a healing effect and can even result in personal growth.<sup>54</sup>

#### TYPE INDICATORS

Type indicators are instruments that psychologists, counselors and others use in aiding an individual to determine his or her type.<sup>55</sup> They are usually deceptively simple and relatively brief.

51. This is the message of Isabel Briggs Myers. See MYERS, *supra* note 7, at 117-25.

52. The president of the National Association for Law Placement has cautioned against the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as a screening device in the hiring process. See Provost & Murray, *Discovery and Judgment: The Newsletter of the Type/Law Network*, May, 1989, at 3.

53. SINGER, *supra* note 3, at 177.

54. *Id.* at 177-82.

55. The Myers-Briggs people stress that it is the individual subject who has the final say on the type determination issue: "Interpretation of MBTI results should be a joint process between the professional giving the interpretation and the respondent reacting. One should never say flatly 'You are such and such a type.' The reported type should be submitted to the respondent's judgment." MYERS & McCAULEY, *supra* note 50, at 52.

The indicators differ from what are usually referred to as psychological *tests* in that they (the indicators) do not measure the strength of psychological *traits* like intelligence. They merely identify one's type *preferences*. Although the indicators might, perhaps, reveal how strongly one prefers to *use* a particular function, they would give no indication as to how well or how poorly developed the function is or how adept one is at using it.

There are many different type indicators in general use today.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps the most commonly used and most thoroughly researched and validated are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator ("MBTI") and the Gray-Wheelwrights Test ("GWT"). The GWT, also known as the Jungian Type Survey, was developed by several Jungian analysts and uses the original eight Jungian categories of preference. The MBTI is now the most widely used type indicator and was developed by two nonprofessional Jungian typologists, Katherine C. Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs Myers.<sup>57</sup> It uses the sixteen type table<sup>58</sup> that Briggs and Myers themselves formulated. Both the GWT and the MBTI are "forced-choice" questionnaires. The responder must choose between two, or occasionally among three, proffered alternative responses, each of which expresses a quite definite preference (as opposed to the familiar "always sometimes occasionally never" format). Chan, in *Working Woman*, provides a sampling of questions from the MBTI: "Which word appeals to you more: Build/invent? In a large group, do you more often introduce others or get introduced? Does following a schedule appeal to you or cramp you?"<sup>59</sup>

The degree to which either the GWT or the MBTI gives accurate results is necessarily problematic to some extent, however slight, because of the fundamental uniqueness<sup>60</sup> and complexity of each individual human being.<sup>61</sup> But a combination of the test or indicator results and the reactions and input of the respondent have made both instruments reliable enough to be widely used.

#### THE UTILITY AND INUTILITY OF TYPOLOGY

Perhaps the most obvious general use for the type tables and the type descriptions is to simply classify human beings into categories. Jung himself, however, was emphatic in his disavowal of that kind of thinking:

---

56. See MATTOON, *supra* note 41, at 74-81 (describing types of indicators).

57. GEORGE H. JENSEN & JOHN K. DiTIBERIO, *PERSONALITY AND THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION* 3-4 (1989).

58. For a detailed description of the sixteen types, see *id.* app. 4.

59. Chan, *Might You Be Happier Doing Something Else?* 14 *WORKING WOMAN*, Apr., 1989, at 168.

60. The careful reader will perhaps have observed that there is what seems to be a basic inconsistency between the concept of types and the concept of individual uniqueness. Hillman has addressed this anomaly eloquently—one might almost say mystically—in HILLMAN, *supra* note 26.

61. See MATTOON, *supra* note 41, at 75-77.

"It is not the purpose of a psychological typology to classify human beings into categories—this in itself would be pretty pointless."<sup>62</sup> Jung's own idea of the purpose of his theory was quite focused. He saw it as filling a gap. The discipline of psychology was, in Jung's view at the time, and perhaps still is, somewhat *undisciplined*. It lacked a framework and an orientation. The need was for a "critical" psychology, i.e., one with something on which to ground or base its concepts and its speculations. Jung hoped that his psychological type theory would be just that. "[It] is an attempt, grounded on practical experience, to provide an explanatory basis and theoretical framework for the boundless diversity that has hitherto prevailed in the formation of psychological *concepts*."<sup>63</sup>

Whether Jung himself would have countenanced all of the uses to which his type theory is being put today is, in light of the above-quoted views, doubtful.<sup>64</sup> Contemporary typologists, however, are indeed classifying human beings into categories (with the type "indicators" doing exactly that, i.e., indicating in which type category one likely belongs). Moreover, they are finding uses for typology far beyond Jung's sanguine hope of creating a basis for a critical psychology. The interesting (and perhaps to some disturbing) thing is that most of the uses to which the contemporary typologists are putting the theory are productive and progressive.

In education, for example, a teacher with a clear knowledge of type will be more imaginative in ascertaining why some teaching approaches work on some children and not on others. Type theory alerts one to the fact that some pupils learn best from a factual approach, some from an analytical approach, some from a relational approach and some from a participatory approach.<sup>65</sup> In counseling, whether it is educational, marital or occupational, a knowledge of type and type theory is an asset. Some counseling approaches work better with some types.<sup>66</sup> Also, in conflict situations, an appreciation of type differences can facilitate healing and reconciliation.<sup>67</sup> In situations requiring teamwork, such as the setting up of managerial task forces or committees, a knowledge of type (as well as an assortment of complementary types) is beneficial. A single-function approach to the solving of any business problem is likely to be short-sighted. In human relations in general, a knowledge of type can and often does promote understanding and tolerance.<sup>68</sup>

Other uses seem more problematic. One recent study suggested the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as a hiring aid to identify personality

---

62. JUNG, *supra* note 4, at 554-55.

63. *Id.* at 555 (emphasis added).

64. See, e.g., HILLMAN, *supra* note 26, at 23-26. Indeed, categorizing persons into types does seem to contradict one of the fundamental tenets of Jung's analytical psychology i.e., that individuality is unique, unpredictable and uninterpretable. *Id.* at 26-27

65. See, e.g., LAWRENCE, *supra* note 49.

66. See ALEX T. QUENK, *PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPES AND PSYCHOTHERAPY* 40-41 (1984).

67. *Id.* at 37-40.

68. For an account of the suggested uses of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, see MYERS & McCAULEY, *supra* note 50, at 4, 5.



types which might be well suited to the job of hospital admitting supervisor.<sup>69</sup> The use of the type indicators as hiring aids in the sense of prospective employee screening devices was, of course, never recommended by Jung, and is indeed frowned upon by the type indicator people themselves.<sup>70</sup> According to Fortune Magazine, the corporate world, which is now "by far" the biggest user of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator,<sup>71</sup> uses the indicator not so much as a prospective-employee screening device as an aid in management development programs; even then it is only used as a self-knowledge enhancer,<sup>72</sup> not as a screening device.

If there is a particular concern about the use of personality type indicators in the context of law study or entry into the legal profession, it is a concern that would be shared by any profession or occupation. If well meaning counselors channel into the law schools only those who are supposedly well suited for or who can be predicted to find reasonable contentment in the law, the effect on the law and the legal system is at best problematic. According to some studies, INFPs and ENFPs have had the highest dropout rates in law schools.<sup>73</sup> Should INFPs and ENFPs be discouraged from going to law school? What will the law and the legal system lose in the way of feeling and people-oriented values if that should occur? It may be the logic in some individual cases that an INFP or an ENFP should perhaps have second thoughts about entering law school, but it is perhaps also the logic from the profession's point of view that INFPs and ENFPs in general should be encouraged to pursue law so that the law will have the benefit of their unique perspectives. It is probably not rash to suggest that today lawyers, as a group, are not perceived by the public at large as being especially sensitive in the areas of social values and concern for people, areas that are particular strengths of the INFP and ENFP types. The point is that an overly aggressive use of personality type indicators in the context of avenues of entry into the legal profession, or any profession for that matter, could have the effect of narrowing the vision of the profession.

Some, of course, might argue that the vision of the profession is already narrowed by what has been going on for some time now in law school classrooms. Law professors have, for generations, routinely advised beginning law students that their task is to learn to "think like a lawyer." Different professors perhaps mean different things when they voice that aphorism, but most probably understand the statement to mean that the student's task is to become proficient in the type of "thinking" that stresses attention to facts, rules and logic, as opposed to intuitions, values and people-oriented feelings. It may, indeed, be that it is this very "think-

---

69. *Personality Research May Yield New Aids to Hiring Admitters*, HOSP ADMITTING MONTHLY, July 1982, at 3-6.

70. See, e.g., MYERS & MCCAULEY, *supra* note 50, at 78.

71. Thomas Moore, *Personality Tests Are Back*, FORTUNE, March 30, 1987 at 74.

72. *Id.*

73. See Miller, *supra* note 1.

like-a-lawyer" atmosphere that motivates NF types to have second thoughts about continuing in law school. Some, however, would no doubt suggest that this is exactly what should occur; it is not without reason that the statue of justice invariably wears a blindfold. Justice is, to some, nothing but facts, rules and logic, unimpeded by intuitions and feelings (which smack of favoritism or politics). And yet there is the persistent intrusion into jurisprudence of the phenomenon of "equity," a conceptual system that does seem to be guided by a responsible attention to intuitions, feelings and values. When those whose personality types portend a sensitivity to intuitions, feelings and values are subtly steered away from the law, the effect on the profession and on the legal system itself is not difficult to surmise. Facts, rules and logic were the exclusive residents of Dickens' *Bleak House*.

None of this is, of course, the "fault" of personality type indicators; they could easily be used in an effort to increase numbers of NF types in the profession as to decrease them. The indicators are simply tools to be used for good or for ill. And so, in the end, it may be that psychological typology is both heresy *and* salvation—with significant potentials for good and for ill, depending on the motive and the skill of the user—both boon and boondoggle, not unlike most blessings, mixed.

